

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 27, 2001
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

Orders were filed in the following matters extending the time within which to grant or deny a petition for review to and including the date indicated, or until review is either granted or denied:

A096698/S102225 Elnora Terrell v. Alameda County Superior Court; Donald A. Kirby et al., RPIs – February 14, 2002.

B151878/S102101 In re Darren T. Pendleton on Habeas Corpus – February 4, 2002.

C033363/S101952 People v. Frank Lynn Tholmer – February 5, 2002.

E030415/S102228 In re Jamel D. Bell on Habeas Corpus – February 14, 2002.

F022835/S102037 People v. Carl Franklin Harrison – February 11, 2002.

H018866/S102068 People v. Brian Damar Daniels et al. – February 13, 2002.

S026040 People, Respondent
v.

Richard Vieira, Appellant

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General John O’Sullivan’s representation that he anticipates filing the respondent’s brief by March 15, 2002, counsel’s request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to March 15, 2002. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S027555 People, Respondent
v.

Alfredo R. Prieto, Appellant

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Bradley Weinreb’s representation that he anticipates filing the respondent’s brief by March 1, 2002, counsel’s request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 19, 2002. After that date, only one further extension totaling additional 10 days is contemplated.

S033360 People, Respondent

v.

Keone Wallace, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including February 26, 2002.

S034110 People, Respondent

v.

Mark Christopher Crew, Appellant

Good cause appearing, and based upon Assistant State Public Defender Andrew S. Love's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's reply brief by February 26, 2002, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 26, 2002. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S037006 People, Respondent

v.

Michael James Huggins, Appellant

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Allan Yannow's representation that he anticipates filing the respondent's brief by March 21, 2002, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 4, 2002. After that date, only one further extension totaling 45 additional days is contemplated.

S042224 People, Respondent

v.

Tomas Verano Cruz, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including February 25, 2002.

S090636 In re Steven D. Catlin

on

Habeas Corpus

Good cause appearing, and based upon Supervising Deputy Attorney General Stephen G. Herndon's representation that he anticipates filing the informal response by April 26, 2002,

counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to January 25, 2002. After that date, only three further extensions totaling 90 additional days are contemplated.

S094239 In re Michael Lamont Jones
 on
 Habeas Corpus

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file petitioner's reply to informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including January 25, 2002.

S049389 People, Respondent
 v.
 Thomas Howard Lenart, Appellant

Appellant's application for relief from default to file appellant's opening is granted.

S103106 Cornelius Anderson, Petitioner
 v.
 Santa Barbara County Superior Court, Respondent
 People, Real Party in Interest

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition shall be denied.

S103150 Carl D. McQuillion, Petitioner
 v.
 San Luis Obispo County Superior Court, Respondent
 People, Real Party in Interest

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Six, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition shall be denied.